



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/915,982	07/25/2001	Edward O. Lee	10002421-1	8176

7590 03/29/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Art Unit: 2178

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the amendment, and IDS filed on 12/8/2004, and 3/7/2005 respectively.

**This action is made Final.**

2. In the amendment, claims 28-30 have been added. Claims 1-30 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are independent claims.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement filed 3/7/2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. There is no copy of foreign patent GB 2 300 991 A.

### ***Drawings***

4. The drawings filed on 7/25/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-27 remain, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dodge et al, hereinafter Dodge (Pat.# 5,655,130, 8/15/1997).

Regarding independent claim 1, Dodge teaches creating documentation, which includes several variations elements of a document, in a computer, such as a server—*associating a content item with a publication in the server* -- (col.6, lines 42-67, col.7 , lines 1-67, col.8, line 65-col.9, line 20).

Furthermore, Dodge teaches the generation of an output document from a database, storing the documentation, by filtering or excluding unwanted platform-specific variation(s) of a document from several platform-specific document variations, such as PC, or Unix paragraphs – *identifying a presentation platform from a number of potential presentation platforms*—located in the database. The output document contains at least one variation-specific data element, such as PC, or Unix paragraphs—*content item in a format recognizable by the presentation platform* -. The filtering or extraction of the output document is done at a file server (col.6, lines 57-67, col.7, lines 1-67, col.8, line 65-col.9, line 20, fig. 2-3).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Dodge teaches the generation of an output document from a database storing the documentation, by allowing a user to indicate the filtering or exclusion of unwanted data variation elements, such as PC, Unix, audience etc., (col.7, lines 1-17, 51-67, fig. 2-3). In other words, a filter parses, selects and extracts platform-specific documentation from a database containing multiple document variation elements or paragraphs, based on a user request or indication.

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Dodge teaches the generation of an output document from a database storing the documentation, by allowing a user to filter or exclude unwanted data variation elements, such as PC, Unix, audience etc., (col.7, lines 1-17, 51-67, fig. 2-3).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Dodge teaches the generation of an output document from a database storing the documentation, by allowing a user to filter or exclude unwanted data variation elements, such as PC, Unix, audience etc., from a file server using a filter located on a client workstation (col.7, lines 1-17, 51-67, col.9, lines 11-20, fig. 2-3).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Dodge teaches the checking of boxes—*identifying publication identifier in a publication request--* associated with platform specific documentation, and filtering out from a database the documentation—*searching a content database from the content item based upon the publication identifier--* whose checkbox was not checked (col.7, lines 1-17, 51-67, col.9, lines 1-20, col.11, lines 8-23, 44-67, fig. 2-3).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Dodge teaches the encapsulation of SGML data elements belonging to four different platforms into a source data file—*generating at least one intermediate file, wherein the content item is associated with the intermediate file.*

Boxes are checked, which are associated with platform specific documentation (to be used in a computer platform compatible by such documentation, such as a pc, unix computer, etc.), which causes the filtering from, a database or source file of platform-specific document- whose checkbox was not checked, into a platform-specific document—*transforming the at least one intermediate file into the output file-* (col.6, lines 32-67, col.7, lines 1-17, 51-67, col.11, lines 8-23, 44-67, fig. 2-3).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Dodge teaches that boxes—*publication identifier--* are checked, which are associated with platform specific documentation (to be used in a computer platform compatible by such documentation, such as a pc, unix computer—*presentation platform identifier*, etc.), which causes the filtering out from a database or source file of platform-specific document whose checkbox was not checked (col.6, lines 32-67, col.7, lines 1-17, 51-67, col.11, lines 8-23, 44-67, fig. 2-3).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 6, Dodge teaches the encapsulation of SGML data elements belonging to four different platform in a source data file—*populating the content item into the intermediate file* (col.6, lines 32-67, col.7, lines 1-17, 51-67, col.11, lines 8-23, 44-67, fig. 2-3).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 7, Dodge teaches that boxes—*publication identifier*-- are checked, which are associated with platform specific documentation (to be used in a computer platform compatible by such documentation, such as a pc, unix computer—*presentation platform identifier*, etc.), which causes the filtering out from a server database, a platform-specific source file, whose checkbox was not checked (col.6, lines 32-67, col.7, lines 1-17, 51-67, col.9, lines 1-20, col.11, lines 8-23, 44-67, fig. 2-3).

Claims 10-18 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 1-9 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 19-27 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 1-9 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 1, Dodge teaches the generation of an output document from a database storing the documentation, by allowing a user to indicate the filtering or exclusion of unwanted data variation elements, such as PC, Unix, audience etc., and outputting a document, such as a document having text indicating information of each platform—*each of the content items comprises an amount of text that is platform generic with respect to each of the potential presentation platforms* (col.6, lines 43-67, fig. 2-3). In other words, a filter parses, selects and extracts platform-specific documentation, along with text, from

Art Unit: 2178

a database containing multiple document variation elements or paragraphs, based on a user request or indication.

Claims 29-30 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claim 28, and therefore are similarly rejected.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 12/8/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "Dodge fails to show or suggest at least the element of identifying a presentation platform from a number of potential presentation platforms upon which to present the publication" page 9, parag. 3) are not recited in the rejected claim(s) (specially the highlighted section). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Moreover, Applicant states that Dodge does not teach or suggest the generation of an output file that includes a content recognizable by the presentation platform (page 9, parag. 4). The Examiner disagrees, because Dodge teaches the generation of an output document or file, which includes content recognizable by a specific platform, such as PC, UNIX, etc., (col.6, lines 57-67, col.7, lines 1-32, 60-67).



Claims 10, and 19 are rejected at least based on the same rationale established above.

Regarding claim 6, the Applicant notes that Dodge does not teach the newly added limitation of transforming an intermediate file into an output file (page 10). The Examiner disagrees, because Dodge teaches the encapsulation of SGML data elements belonging to four different platforms into a source data file—*generating at least one intermediate file, wherein the content item is associated with the intermediate file*. Boxes are checked, which are associated with platform specific documentation (to be used in a computer platform compatible by such documentation, such as a pc, unix computer, etc.), which causes the filtering from, a database or source file of platform-specific document- whose checkbox was not checked, into a platform-specific document—*transforming the at least one intermediate file into the output file-* (col.6, lines 32-67, col.7, lines 1-17, 51-67, col.11, lines 8-23, 44-67, fig. 2-3).

#### ***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2178

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (703) 703-872-9306, (for all Formal communications intended for entry)

  
**CESAR PAULA**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

3/23/05